S. K. SIDDE GOWDA and S. THIMME GOWDA *alias* THAMMAYYA GOWDA and A. LINGE GOWDA (Krishnarajpet Taluk); C. DASAPPA (Heggadadevankote Taluk); GURUBASAPPA (Chamarajanagar Taluk); MIR RAZA ALI (Minorities); B. S.PUTTASWAMY (Nanjangud Taluk); H. HOMBE GOWDA, N. VEERARAJ URS and PATEL SIDDE GOWDA (T.-Narsipur Taluk); H. HONNAIYA and M. L. LINGANNA (Mandya Taluk); PATEL SANNA MALLAPPA (Yelandur Jahgir); K. KEMPE GOWDA (Mandya Municipality); A. THAMMAYYA (Minorities); B. SIDDALINGA SETTY (Special Interests) and S. C. MALLIAH (Maddur Taluk).—

Q.—13. Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) Did Mr. Basappa, Representative Assembly and District Board Member of Heggadadevankote Taluk, apply to the District Magistrate for the grant to him of an exemption certificate, as per rules, to possess a gun and, if so, when?

(*b*) Why has no certificate been granted to him yet?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN).—

A. (*a*) Yes, on 3rd July 1934.

(*b*) A certificate has been granted.

MR. H. K. MADIAH.—With reference to answer to (*b*), may I know when the certificate was granted?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—About a month ago.

MR. H. K. MADIAH.—The application was made in July 1934 and the certificate was granted in May 1935. Why was there so much delay in granting the certificate?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—Certain enquiries had to be made and they naturally took time.

MR. M. C. LINGE GOWDA.—What was the sort of enquiry that was necessary for so long a time?

MR K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—It is unnecessary to go into the nature of the enquiry that was necessary. But I may assure the member that there was sufficient reason for the delay.

MR. H. K. MADIAH.—Will the Government see that at least in future such inordinate delays are avoided?

MR. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—Yes.

Allegations against the Agricultural Officer of the Sugar Factory.

MESSRS. H. K. MADIAH and M. K. SUBBIAH (Malvalli Taluk); SIVANANJE GOWDA and SAVANDIAH (Mysore Taluk); T. M. KAPANAYYA GOWDA and K. M KRISHNAPPA GOWDA (Nagamangala Taluk); S. K. SIDDE GOWDA and S. THIMME GOWDA *alias* THAMMAYYA GOWDA and A. LINGE GOWDA (Krishnarajpet Taluk); C. DASAPPA (Heggadadevankote Taluk); GURUBASAPPA (Chamarajanagar Taluk); MIR RAZA ALI (Minorities); B. S. PUTTASWAMY (Nanjangud Taluk); H HOMBE GOWDA, N. VEERARAJ URS and PATEL SIDDE GOWDA (T.-Narsipur Taluk); H. HONNAIYA and M. L. LINGANNA (Mandya Taluk); PATEL SANNA MALLAPPA (Yelandur Jahgir); K. KEMPE GOWDA (Mandya Municipality); A. THAMMAYYA (Minorities); B. SIDDALINGA SETTY (Special Interests) and S. C. MALLIAH (Maddur Taluk).—

Q.—14. Will the Government be pleased to state:—

Have petitions been received by higher officers regarding the high-handedness and conduct of the Agricultural Officer of the Sugar Factory at Mandya?

THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT (MR. M. VENKATANARANAPPA).—

A.—Yes; but, on investigation, the allegations were found to be baseless.

MR. H. HOMBE GOWDA.—May I know who conducted the investigation referred to in the answer?

MR. M. VENKATANARANAPPA.—The Chairman of the Sugar Factory and the Director of Agriculture.

MR H. HOMBE GOWDA.—Were any of the complainants sent for at the time of investigation?

MR. M. VENKATANARANAPPA.—Notice.

MR. H. HOMBE GOWDA.—When the Chairman was at Mandya, did not some

raiyats approach him in person and complain against the Agricultural Officer?

THE SECOND MEMBER (*Rajamanträ-pravina* S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI).—They might have.

MR. H. HOMBE GOWDA.—Will the Government see that the officer complained against does not conduct himself similarly in future also?

MR. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—There is no reason to warrant such an apprehension.

MR. H. HOMBE GOWDA.—Is it not a fact that complaints have been sent even after the Chairman's investigation?

MR. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—The Chairman is enquiring into them also. But, I may explain that the complaints related to grant of lands according to the personal whims of the officer. The reply to them is that no single officer granted lands and that it was left to a sub-committee consisting of the Executive Engineer, the Sub-Division Officer and the officer in question. This sub-committee disposed of lands in accordance with the instructions given them by the Board of Directors of the Factory.

MR. H. HOMBE GOWDA.—Was there not a complaint that this officer was not following any principle in the matter of accepting sugar-cane supplies meant for the factory?

MR. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—Purchase of cane is a thing left to the factory authorities themselves.

MR. M. SUBBIAH.—When charges of corruption are levelled against any officer of Government, is it not the duty of the Government to hold a thorough enquiry and give full opportunities for the complainants to prove their case? May I know if this has been done in the present case and who were all the witnesses, if any, examined?

MR. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—I do not think the method of enquiry and details like that can be gone into on the floor of the House.

MR. S. C. MALLIAH.—Is it not a fact that in many cases the Agricultural Officer accepted cane from persons who had not obtained seedlings from the factory and that supplies from parties who came forward subsequently were accepted while those from others who had come earlier were not?

THE CHAIRMAN OF THE SUGAR FACTORY (MR. N. MADHAVA RAO).—All those complaints have been gone into and necessary relief afforded in all possible cases.

MR. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR.—When was the enquiry held and why were not the complainants sent for at the time of enquiry?

MR. N. MADHAVA RAO.—The complaints were heard in person. The enquiry was held three times: first in August of last year, next when my friend the Director of Industries and Commerce was Chairman of the Company and once again recently. As a result of these enquiries, it has been found that the officer has not done anything arbitrarily. But, in order to see that no room was given for such complaints thereafter, an informal committee was appointed to help the Company in allotting areas for planting sugar-cane.

MR. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR.—How long after the complaints were received did you hold the enquiry?

MR. N. MADHAVA RAO.—Soon after.

MR. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR.—How was the Chairman able to come to the conclusion that the officer had not done anything wrong?

THE FIRST MEMBER (*Rajamantra-pravina Diwan Bahadur* K. MATTHAN).—The Chairman had enough material before him for doing so.

MR. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR.—What was the material?

MR. K. MATTHAN.—We cannot go into all those details here.

MR. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR.—Was the Agricultural Officer also examined in the course of the enquiry?

MR. K. MATTHAN.—Yes.

MR. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR.—Were the complainants present at that time?

MR. K. MATTHAN.—That is a matter of detail. But I may say that the enquiry has been properly conducted.

MR. T. MARIAPPA.—What is the name of the officer concerned?

MR. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—It is

not so material to the question under reply.

MR. T. MARIAPPA.—Was not this the same officer who was for some time in charge of the Babbur Farm when similar complaints were made against him in this Assembly ?

MR. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—I do not know.

MR. T. MARIAPPA.—If there are so many complaints against that particular officer, is it not desirable to transfer him to some other place ?

MR. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—The member is only repeating a question which has been disallowed by the President.

MR. M. C. LINGE GOWDA.—Has it come to the notice of the Government that this officer accepted cane from private parties who had not obtained seedlings from the company ?

MR. N. MADHAVA RAO.—That was in accordance with the decision of the Board of Directors.

MR. M. C. LINGE GOWDA.—Is it a fact that cane was accepted by him from parties who did not even own lands of their own ?

MR. N. MADHAVA RAO.—There is nothing to prevent the factory from accepting cane from any suppliers provided it is good in quality and is supplied when it is wanted.

MR. M. C. LINGE GOWDA.—If cane is accepted from persons who have not obtained seedlings from the factory, will it not put to loss other cane-growers who had obtained seedlings from the factory ?

MR. N. MADHAVA RAO.—I do not think that there can be any grievance on that account.

MR. M. C. LINGE GOWDA.—Has the factory notified that cane would be accepted from all people ?

MR. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—The company requires several thousands of tons of cane. It should therefore be left to the company to decide how best to secure such large quantities.

MR. M. C. LINGE GOWDA.—Will the Government enquire whether there is a grievance of the kind represented or not ?

MR. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—Yes.

MR. H. B. GUNDAPPA.—In view of the large number of charges of a grave nature levelled against the officer concerned, will the Government be pleased to take necessary explanations from him and decide how far it would be desirable to continue him in service ?

MR S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—What action should be taken or not in the matter should be left to Government themselves.

MR. S. K. VENKATARANGA IYENGAR.—In view of the fact that the allegations made against this officer have been found to be baseless, as stated in the answer, will the Government consider the question of ordering a prosecution in the case ?

MR. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—It is not a request for information.

MR. S. K. VENKATARANGA IYENGAR.—If irresponsible allegations are made against officers of Government, their work becomes very difficult. In order to show that people should not make such reckless charges, is it not desirable to order a prosecution even now ?

MR. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—It is a matter of opinion.

MR. S. K. VENKATARANGA IYENGAR.—Was the investigation held a departmental investigation as opposed to judicial ?

MR. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—Notice.

MR. S. K. VENKATARANGA IYENGAR.—Was it a confidential or open investigation ?

MR. K. MATTHAN.—I do not think we need go into those matters now.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS—BILLS. (*contd*).

VI. Statement of General Principles of the Bill to Amend the Mysore Agriculturists' Relief Regulation, 1928.

THE GENERAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (MR. H. V. RAMASVAMI) explained the general principles of the Bill as follows :—

" In September 1934, a committee was appointed by the Government under the Chairmanship of *Rajasabhabhushana*